

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in this application, while claims 1-19 stand rejected. Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-15, and 19 have been amended, claims 16-18 have been canceled without prejudice, and new claim 20-33 have been added. Support for the amendment can be found in the entire specification and the figures 4-6. No new matter has been added by the amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and following remarks.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102***Claims 1, 6-7, 10, and 19***

Claims 1, 6-7, 10, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hashimoto et al., US Patent No. 5,956,107 (hereinafter "Hashimoto") for the reasons stated on pages 2-3 of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Hashimoto, however, fails to disclose or teach each and every element as set forth in independent claims 1, 13, and 19.

Claim 1 recites a liquid crystal display apparatus comprising: a liquid crystal display panel that displays a picture; a back light assembly that emits light to the liquid crystal display panel, the back light assembly including: first and second light guide plates spaced from each other; a first lamp assembly disposed adjacent to the first light guide plate; a second lamp assembly disposed adjacent to the second light guide plate; a mold frame to support the back light assembly, the mold frame including: a first accommodation space to receive the first light guide plate and the first lamp assembly; a second accommodation space to receive the second light guide and the second lamp assembly; and a spacing part disposed between the first and second lamp assemblies. Figure 4 of the Application, for example, teaches that the spacing part is disposed between the first and second lamp assemblies, thereby separating the first and second

lamp assemblies from each other and preventing electrical interferences between the lamp assemblies.

On the contrary, the figure 2 of Hashimoto teaches that light sources 3 and 8 directly face each other. Hashimoto fails to disclose or teach the element "a spacing part disposed between the first and second lamp assemblies", as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Hashimoto neither anticipates nor renders claim 1 obvious because it fails to disclose or teach each and every element as set forth in claim 1. Since it contain similar features, claim 19 is believed to be patentable over Hashimoto for at least the reasons given for claim 1. Claims 6-7 and 10 depend from claim 1, and thus are believed to be allowable due to their dependency on claim 1.

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 13-19

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 13-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Iwamoto et al., US Patent No. 5,046,826 (hereinafter "Iwamoto") for the reasons stated on page 3 of the Office Action. Since claims 16-18 have been canceled without prejudice, the rejection of claims 16-18 is moot. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The abstract and the figure 1 of Iwamoto teach that a plurality of transparent sheet-like members 108 laminated to each other forms a light-transmitting member, and a light source 101-1 is disposed on the light-incoming side of the light-transmitting member. Therefore, it is the transparent sheet-like members 108 that are disposed between the light sources 101-1. Thus, Iwamoto fails to disclose or teach the element "a spacing part disposed between the first and second lamp assemblies", as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Iwamoto neither anticipates nor renders claim 1 obvious.

Since they contain similar features, claims 13 and 19 are believed to be patentable over Hashimoto for at least the reasons given for claim 1. Claims 2-4 and 6-10 depend from claim 1, and claims 14-15 depend from claim 13. These dependent claims are believed to be allowable due to their dependency on claims 1 and 13.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103***Claim 5***

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwamoto for the reasons stated on pages 3-4 of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art; and that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970).

As stated above, Iwamoto fails to teach or suggest the element "a spacing part disposed between the first and second lamp assemblies", as recited in claim 1, from which claim 5 depends. Therefore, Iwamoto does not render claim 1 obvious, because it fails all elements as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, it is believed that claim 5 is allowable due to its dependency on claim 1.

Claims 11 and 12

Claims 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto and/or Iwamoto, in view of Applicant's admitted prior art (hereinafter "APA"), figure 1, for the reasons stated on page 4 of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As stated above, any of the references does not teach or suggest the element "a spacing part disposed between the first and second lamp assemblies", as recited in claim 1, from which claims 11 and 12 depend. Therefore, the combination of Hashimoto, Iwamoto, and APA does not render claim 1 obvious, because it fails all elements as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, it is believed that claims 11 and 12 are allowable due to its dependency on claim 1.

New Claims

New claims 27-30 depend from claim 1, new claims 31-33 depend from claim 13, and new claims 20-26 depend from claim 19. These dependent claims are believed to be allowable due to their dependency on claims 1, 13, and 19.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicant's attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: 

Soonja Bae
Limited Recognition No. L0017
Confirmation No. 9296
Cantor Colburn LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
PTO Customer No. 23413
Telephone: (860) 286-2929
Facsimile: (860) 286-0115

Date: June 24, 2005